DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 879 SP 028 955

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE The Influence of Competing Cultures on Teacher Development.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Cultural Background; *Faculty Development; General Education; Higher Education; Humanities; Individual Development; *Liberal Arts; Preservice Teacher Education; Specialization; *Teacher Education Programs; *Values

ABSTRACT

This document explores how basic American cultural value patterns have influenced the nature of general studies, specialization, and professional education in programs of teacher education. The value patterns examined deal with individualism, the work ethic and the civic arts. These patterns are analyzed in terms of their control over what knowledge is offered to teachers and how it is offered. Emphasis on the liberal arts is traced to the value themes related to individualism. Implications are drawn from these values to explain the nature of teacher development as a form of individual development. A second set of values referring to achievement and success is presented as the rationale for professional education. Implications are drawn for teacher education as a system directed at technical proficiency and student achievement. The third set of values analyzed deals with the role of general education in teacher education. The implications of perceiving education as a common good or as a personal good are analyzed in terms of their influence on teacher education. The paper analyzes teacher education--its form and content--as a system which does not transcend its historic and cultural bases. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED282879

# The Influence of Competing Cultures on Teacher Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Haberman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Martin Haberman
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

SP028955

Martin Haberman 7/10/87

Attempts to improve teachers tend to focus on either improved pedagogy, more subject matter, individual growth, or in rare cases on general studies for civic responsibility. Pedagogy refers to providing teachers with specific instructional skills as well as knowledge of children's learning, growth and development. More subject matter refers to the persistent and widespread assumption that what teachers really need in order to increase their pupils' achievement is more expertise in the subject(s) they teach. Teacher growth refers to the strong tradition in teacher education that if teachers were better people--more humane, with greater self understanding, more reflective, more sensitive, more empathetic, more fully self-actualized--they would inevitably be better teachers. General studies and civic responsibility refers to the contention that teachers are apolitical, uninvolved in their communities and essentially non-participants as citizens; to be "developed", teachers need more knowledge of how the economy, government and society function, as well as the critical thinking skills for integrating this knowledge and applying it to the problems of living.

It is my contention that our universities reflect value theories basic to American society. The liberal arts, professional and general studies which coexist in the modern university are derived from the belief systems which characterize our general culture. I would contend that the university based study of pedagogy reflects the American value patterns which advocate achievement and success, activity and work, efficiency and practicality, material comfort, science and secular rationality. On the other hand, the development of the liberal arts college and the modern university as the primary societal institution in which individuals may actualize their

potentialities and personal proclivities, reflects the American patterns related to the values of individual personality, humanitarian mores, equality and freedom. Finally, the development of citizen responsibility and critical thinking (i.e., the civic arts) in the general studies programs of universities reflects the societal value patterns which undergird our commitments to democratic institutions and the concept of the common good.

This chapter traces the cultural antecedents which are used to justify the use of these approaches with teachers and will argue that these cultural themes have been a major force in shaping our universities, the curricula of our lower schools and the content of our teacher education programs. Based on this analysis, predictions will be made regarding which approaches to teacher development will continue in future as dominant practices and which will be of less importance.

Individualism, The Liberal Arts and Teacher Development

In tracing the set of values which comprise the American vision of individualism, several things become clear. There are different versions of individualism which are ambiguous and even contradictory. Bellah (et al.) discusses four types of individualism: biblical, civic, utilitarian and expressive. Briefly, biblical individualism grows out of the responsibility and accountability believed to be lodged in each individual as s/he relates to God. Civic individualism refers to the legal and political rights which are the foundation of the concept "citizen" in a democratic society. Utilitarian individualism is an economic set of values that undergirc the belief that if individuals pursue their economic self interests the society as a whole will be served best. Expressive individualism refers to the search for personal

meaning (psychologic, artistic, developmental) which has become so very characteristic of modern American society. There is even a fifth definition--mythic individualism--embodied in the legend of the cowboy and in other American folk heroes; the self-made, inner directed person who is supposedly free of restraints.

The values related to individualism were first manifested in the earliest development of the American university. In describing the University of Virginia, Jefferson made it clear that he didn't believe any student should study any course unless he felt like it and although Jefferson was not credited by the students of the 1960's, his view of a self-selected curriculum qualified him as a colonial hippie. In truth, Jefferson was simply pre Carl Rogers in his view that genuine learning must utilize students' interests, predispositions and little else. It fell to President Eliot of Harvard to establish his institution as one of the first to make the elective course an acceptable part of college students' curriculum.

As far as university organization is concerned, therefore, the spirit of individualism is embodied in the college of liberal arts and to a lesser degree, in the college of fine arts. By definition, professional colleges (e.g., engineering, agriculture, medicine, law, education, etc.) are filled with course and other requirements which must be met before the particular profession will accept a graduate as a bona fide practitioner. It doesn't matter what a future nurse, librarian or architect "feels" like studying, as much as what the practicing profession decides the neophyte must study. The primary goal of professional education is not the individual fulfillment of the practitioner but the protection and service of the public, and the

willingness of those already in the profession to accept as a colleague a beginner who has demonstrated proficiencies similar to their own. This role of the liberal arts colleges as the primary home for academic individualists, therefore, is not only a function of liberal arts faculties reaching out to cultivate students in their individualism but also the result of professional schools being unreceptive to students whose highest priority is pursuing their own inclinations and finding themselves. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly common for the liberal arts colleges to be "home" for a large body of students who cannot gain admission to the professional schools, or who cannot decide on a profession, but who are as fixated on an education leading to a job as those admitted to professional schools. For the avowed liberal arts student, however, there is the perception that academic specialization (i.e., majoring in a liberal art) by virtue of not leading to a particular career is evidence that one is doing one's thing and developing inclinations and predispositions without the inevitable impositions that accrue from knuckling under to some form of professional preparation.

In the universities of the 18th and 19th centuries the very clear and agreed-upon purpose of university education was preparation for leadership. Affluent males studied for the divinity and took the trivium (grammar, logic and rhetoric) and quadrivium (geometry, astronomy, arithmetic and music). As ministers or statesmen, graduates were expected to be leaders in this world, in the next, or in both. There were no professions which required university preparation. Only those males who were unconcerned about their immediate support and a future job could afford the luxury of attending a university. It was admittedly education for an elite student body, but an elite whose

first purpose was defined as public service. There is a tragic, poignant quality in today's disadvantaged ethnic groups and lower socioeconomic constituencies who seek to become admitted to the status of liberal arts study without appreciating the history of such studies. I currently serve on the board of an inner city high school which has adopted as its two specialty curricula, preparation for health fields (e.g., medical records clerks, nurses' aides, etc.) and a parallel program in the liberal arts. This liberal arts curriculum recognizes the need for status without an awareness of its historical meaning, or its anti-job training ethic.

In sum, today's liberal arts colleges are comprised of several types of individualists: those who can afford to pander to their interests, those unable to decide on a career and those unable to enter a professional school. Taken together these individuals comprise a status elite within the university simply by virtue of the station in life held by the original student body and by the history of the American university.

In this century, strange mutations transformed the original subjects taught in the first liberal arts colleges. New fields of knowledge were developed (e.g., psychology, sociology) while other fields "exploded" and were adopted into the curriculum (i.e., the natural sciences). Most important, the subjects that affluent people simply learned in non-university settings were also adopted as bona fide "liberal arts." Among these new liberal arts were studies which were the natural acquisition of rich and gentle folk: modern foreign languages; the discussion and writing of literature and poetry; the analysis of art and architecture; the ability to discuss philosophy; and the reading and writing of history.

In large public universities today's liberal arts colleges have as many as 50 departments, or more, including some which bear titles like Comparative Literature, Afro-American Studies, Women's Studies, Literary Criticism, Communication (in addition to Mass Communication) and even more amorphous titles such as Urban Studies, American Studies, and Twentieth Century Studies. The point, of course, is that in spite of the rhetoric about "liberating" the mind it is possible--and quite common--for students to complete liberal arts majors with an extremely wide variance in the breadth and depth of their knowledge. At one extreme might be a student who spends two years (junior/ senior years) "majoring" in one subject only (e.g., math), while another student becomes involved in broad, interdisciplinary studies with little advanced work in any one discipline. The only generalization that can be made about the liberal arts curricula now offered in over 2200 colleges and universities is that they are all, by definition, higher status than teacher preparation programs offered anywhere. This status is a function of an elitist history and in no way a function of who the wide range of present liberal arts students are or what they know--or who the liberal arts faculties are or what they know.

For our analysis here it is my contention that the liberal arts and their cultural roots must be understood in order to fully grasp the complex nature of American individualism as it is currently manifested in lower schools and among teachers. That the liberal arts college claims to produce individualists has been a clear and persistent theme. Graduates are perceived as not only having valuable knowledge but an enhanced self esteem; they are viewed as people who should have come to terms with themselves and their

potentialities as a result of their liberating educations. Point: when teacher education, pre or inservice, permits individual teachers to self select which courses they will take as part of their professional development, it is operating in the cultural mode which emphasizes individual development and in the educational approach traditional in the liberal arts. Similarly, when teachers regard the most useful content of their professional development to be studies which will enhance them as knowledgeable people (i.e., as individual scholars rather than as professional practitioners), they are living out this liberal arts history. The assumptions are clear: if each person enhances his/herself as an individual human being, the practicing professions, will be improved in toto. On a pedestrian level this plays out as teachers being free to travel, enter psychoanalysis or take courses in whatever they please as their inservice development since if they become more complete individuals (however defined) their teaching will inevitably improve. In the late 1950's and early 1960's When Teachers Face Themselves (Jersild) was the most popular book and the most popular inservice course. In the 1980's "burnout" is still frequently cited as a widespread occupational disease. The focus of this inservice approach remains the individual teacher. The process of content determination is the teacher's self selection of courses. The goal of this work is a more fully actualized individual.

There are four confounding trends which enhance this cultural emphasis on individual development: 1) the fact that substantial numbers of liberal arts graduates are still prepared as teachers (Teaching is the only major profession in America for which one can still be prepared in an undergraduate liberal arts college.); 2) the fact that liberal arts courses are still widely

advocated as a basis for improving pedagogy, i.e., in-depth subject matter courses are still seriously proposed as solutions to the problems faced by classroom teachers; 3) the fact that liberal arts courses commonly define their major purpose as the understanding of the individual--his/her personal, social and physical world; and 4) the fact that numerous liberal arts courses actually do provide knowledge useful to teachers under non-pedagogic titles (e.g., writing, speaking, reading, cross cultural communication skill, etc.).

But in spite of these confounding conditions which place liberal arts in a unique relationship with teaching as a profession, I would argue that the primary cultural influence exerted by the liberal arts has not been over the content of pedagogy or even over the curricula of the lower schools, but in its insistence on individual development and in its nurturance of the cultural ideal of the individual as the basic unit of educational analysis. Whether individual is defined in biblical, civic, utilitarian or expressive modes, the institution which American society recognizes as the major preserver of the individualist tradition is the liberal arts college.

In summarizing the influence of competing cultures on teacher development I have tried to trace the relationship between the societal values which deal with individualism and assumptions of how to improve teachers. Following is a summary of these connections. What are dominant value themes in the American culture which support individualism? Humanitarian values about the worth of each individual; equality as it is related to the law and equality of opportunity are both strong, recurrent value patterns; freedom to pursue a particular occupation and life style; and the worth of individual personality as an entity to be nurtured and enhanced are all basic value themes. How

might these value themes be stated as a goal? Teachers should be fully actualized, healthy individuals. What type of education is assumed to be most likely to produce such individuals? A university level education emphasizing the liberal arts. In spite of core requirements for everyone there is wide opportunity for electives and an individual choice of major. Much of the content focuses on understanding both the human condition and the physical world as it impacts on individual development. What kind of students are likely to self-select such education? Students whose highest priority is self development as well as those capable of benefitting from pursuing and developing their own abilities. Students who are not immediately concerned with occupational choice. What kind of teacher education is offered by this approach? Emphasis is on subject matter mastery. Self understanding is also assumed to occur as a result of the emphasis on individual development. How are such teachers evaluated? On the basis of their knowledge of content as well as on their authenticity as people. Their concern with their own development is assumed to translate into a concern for others as individuals. What kind of lower school curriculum does this cultural pattern foster? Individual achievement of established bodies of subject matter is primary. Children/youth will enhance themselves as people through school learning. What kind of staff development would these value patterns lead to? Teachers study more liberal arts subject matter based on their interests and perceived needs. Teachers pursue academic interests and advanced training which they determine will make them more knowledgeable and more fully realized individuals.

Teacher educators have, in my judgement, made a common error of separating the individualism which results from pursuing interests in liberal arts disciplines and the individualism which derives from self-study, whether formal psychoanalysis, reflective thinking or avocational pursuits. All approaches which focus on the cognitive and the emotional development of the individual are assumed to be a fundamental aid to teaching children and youth.

It should go without saying that what has been discussed here is an analysis not an advocacy. Further, that practicing classroom teachers who want a salary increase for a junket to Acapulco are not being offered a rationale. This has been an effort to trace connections between fundamental value themes in the American culture to the development of the liberal arts and to what knowledge, therefore, is considered to be of most worth for teachers. Such tracing has led to the explanation that the strong and continuing liberal arts tradition which pushes those who control teachers to constantly advocate more subject matter is supported by an even stronger American value pattern related to various forms of individualism.

## The Cultural Theme of Achievement and Success and Teacher Education

The only thing harder than understanding American value patterns is living them. There is a constant tension borne of trying to reconcile extremely strong cultural value patterns which pull in opposite directions. At war with the value pattern of individual development and the liberal arts is an even stronger set of "shoulds" which lead Americans to behave as if the basic purpose, indeed the only purpose, for publicly supported education is preparation for the world of work. For the poor, this plays out as the basic

skill curriculum of preschool, elementary and high school that leads to a job after high School graduation or into some form of post-secondary training. For the more affluent, this value is expressed and lived out as a view of college as a means of entering professional study and the pursuit of a higher status career. All study only has value as it moves students along toward a better job. The only difference among social classes is in the level of jobs being sought and in the amount of schooling that is required for the particular occupational level. There is no longer any widespread debate about this. Americans at every level and from all sectors share an agreed-upon goal for schools: to prepare graduates for the world of work. Any real differences which remain among high school dropouts, high school graduates and college graduates is merely the level, power and salary of the particular jobs for which they are being prepared. The notion that society would tax itself at what it considers to be exorbitant rates to provide schools which develop better people, or which enhance individual proclivities, or which seek to educate active citizens of a democratic society, are "theoretic" purposes no longer even debated in the media, by political or economic leaders, or by the public at large. In effect, what Americans have come to want of their schools (pre-school through graduate university levels) is no different from what is wanted by non-democratic and even anti-democratic societies. American students continually have their achievement scores compared with students in other societies and no one even raises the question that our schools should have (might have, could have) other basic purposes which are of equal, or even greater importance, than preparing people for the role of employed tax payer. As education became available to the masses, mass culture transformed it and

substituted the values of pragmatism, utility, and achievement for the values of individual development and those pursuits which did not have immediate payoff.

Popular epithets are a good indicator of our dominant social values. Americans more favorite terms of derogation include "impractical," "irrelevant," "frills and fads," "long-hair professors," and "theorizing." The public support of secular education does not tolerate learning as an ends; that is, learning that leads to more learning. As a result, the education of gentlemen, historical forms of erudition and classical humanism fare rather poorly in comparison with vocational or scientific training. From typing to physics and from cooking to chemistry, modern schooling--at all levels--is permeated by a strong utilitarian and pragmatic emphasis. Its basic purpose is not culture, scholarship, a well-rounded citizenry or the self actualized individual advocated by existential philosophers. Anything other than a curriculum leading to jobs or careers is denigrated as a diversion or amusement. Schooling is a serious business and must answer the popular questions, "What use is it?" and "What can you do with it?" And most important of all, the masses who ask these questions and who judge the quality of the answers are not themselves broadly educated people. In effect, it is the people who are uneducated or undereducated who are most demanding of the coming generations with their "What use is it?" "What good is it?" This frequently plays out as the unemployed or underemployed parents demanding that their elementary schools put a higher priority on reading skills than on other subjects, or as the parents of a college student asking, "Why are you majoring in that?" "What kind of job will that get you?"

Conflicting cultural trends are nothing new in our society or in our educational history. With the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828, government by the elite started to decline. Although Jackson was a rich cotton planter and slaveholder, he endeared himself to both the farm hands and the city proletariat. The mass of Americans saw him as one of their own,, risen from the ranks. Jackson's election was the first in which almost all states allowed individuals to vote for president: henceforth all election campaigns were to be addressed to the bulk of Americans. When the land grant universities were initiated in 1864 there was already a well-established pattern of the mass of people controlling the purposes of public education.

The industrial post-Civil War period saw the rise of technical schools, agricultural and mechanical schools for whites and blacks, and most of all, the development of professional schools (including normal schools for teachers) which were all to become 20th century universities or colleges within universities. It was inevitable that as the numbers of those engaged in post-secondary education increased that their values would come to dominate. Today, at even the most prestigious private universities, the graduate schools which educate the professionals are large, well-endowed institutions and the undergraduate liberal arts colleges remain quite small and selective. To the sophisticated educational status seeker, the issue is not where one earns his/her doctorate or law degree, but where s/he attended as an undergraduate. How many people, and which ones, can affort to pay $50,000 per year to earn a liberal arts bachelor's degree that does not prepare graduates for a specific job?

The pathetic cry of the 45,000 professors of education who complain that preservice and inservice teachers want only "how-to-do-it," "tricks-of-the-trade" and "hands-on" experiences demonstrates a monumental ignorance. These values of immediacy, practicality, relevance, utility--all of which lead to occupational success and achievement--are precisely what most Americans want, not only from all their professional schools, but from their elementary and high schools as well.

What this means for elementary and secondary schools is that job training is now a super value disproportionately more important than anything else the schools might claim as a goal. There are numerous manifestations of this trend but the most obvious is that the skills perceived as necessary for employment have become dominant to the point of driving out the rest of the school curriculum. Such perceived needs include basic reading and computational skills. Once the epicenter of a general education curriculum, the elementary school was developed to include sciences, social studies, the arts, physical education, even foreign languages. As practiced today, however, elementary schools are essentially little more than skills and remediation centers. The teaching of reading and computation skills occupies almost all of every morning and involves superhuman efforts by teachers using small groups and individualized instruction. These efforts are bolstered by aides, resource teachers, most of the schools' materials and text budgets, and computers. Most of the work offered teachers as inservice or continuing education also emphasizes teaching basic skills. In contrast, all the sciences, social studies, arts and everything else in the elementary school curriculum is compressed into afternoons when teachers and children are both

run down. Studies which are not basic skills are supported with little in the way of materials or equipment. Most of all, the individualization and small group instruction which characterizes the teaching of reading skills in the morning is notably missing in the afternoon programs of the elementary school. In the teaching of physical sciences, social studies and arts, even young children are given whole group lecture-like instruction, largely out of texts and treated as if all the assumptions about how children learn (which are implemented in the teaching of reading) do not apply to how individuals learn in the sciences, social studies and arts.

Preschools, which were formerly the bastion of child development people are now also merely skills centers readying their charges for first grade. The justification for this basic skills curriculum supplanting the general studies curriculum of public elementary schools is that such skills are not only prerequisite to all subsequent learning but quintessential job training. America has transformed the process of education into one of schooling and elementary schools into skills centers; and the shift is justified by using the rationale that jobs must be the school's primary goal. The counterargument that a sound, broad general education will lead to a thoughtful, self-actualized, independent minded citizenry who will learn the job skills they need, as and when they need them, is no longer even presented let alone considered. Occasionally a mild dissent is raised when someone admits we don't know specifically what jobs to prepare people for in future but this dilemma is momentary and is not pursued long enough to connect it to the purposes of genuine education for Americans--one that should lead to a thoughtful, problem solving, critical thinking populace who can adapt to change and take action in its own behalf.

The connection between these value patterns and the pre or inservice education of teachers is quite clear. More relevant teaching techniques, more hands-on experiences and less theory are all well known teacher "needs." The teacher center movement in which teachers could train other teachers is the ultimate manifestation of this approach in practice. Specifics on the construction of materials, the making of handouts and the exchange of teacher-to-teacher tips are the dominant focus of these teacher centers. For the purpose of this analysis it is important to note two things: this craft approach to inservice training characterizes every profession and results from practitioners being responsible for their own professional development; this form of professional development is also understood and supported by the mass of Americans.

As a summary, the answers to the same questions posed in the preceding section follow: What are the dominant value themes in the American culture which support professionalism? The commitment of American society to the belief that achievement leads to success; the inherent value attributed to activity and work; the positive values placed on efficiency, practicality, and know-how; the belief that one is entitled to material comforts that have been earned; and the commitment to a philosophy based on scientific knowledge and pragmatic action. How might these values be stated as a goal? Teachers should know how to get students to learn. They should have the technical know-how to do what they're paid for. Teachers are technical implementers of the curriculum developed by the public. What type of education is most likely to produce such individuals? A university based education that not only includes the liberal arts but a relevant professional preparation. This means

extensive hands-on, direct experiences; observing and working under master teachers; learning the specific craft aspects of teaching. What kinds of students are likely to self select such an education? Typical Americans who believe college (or any education) should lead to a specific job or career. People who value the fact that their educations will be (should be) as specific as possible to the occupation they will perform subsequently. Students who are not searching for "identity" or who are overly concerned with exploring the range of university options. What kind of teacher education is offered by this approach? The same goals as now stated but delivered more effectively. Less "Mickey Mouse" courses at the university but more direct experiences in schools. More knowledge of direct instruction derived from research and more knowledge of precisely "what works." Inservice should focus on workshops rather than courses and on specific approaches to discipline rather than theories of classroom management; there should also be widespread use of videotapes of one's own classroom and conferences with teaching colleagues serving as mentors. How are such teachers evaluated? Evaluations include both the learning of the children/youth as measured on standardized tests and the processes followed by the teachers. Do the teachers demonstrate the observable behaviors recommended in the literature of direct instruction? Do the teachers implement the practices advocated by the particular school system in which they are employed? What kind of lower school curriculum does this cultural pattern foster? Skills learning which is assumed to be "basic" and preprequisite to future jobs and careers is directly related to this form of teacher training. (This is specific teacher training not broad teacher education.) Children and youth are expected to work hard, do well in school

and be thoroughly prepared for the world of work upon high school graduation, or for the university professional schools. What kind of staff development would these value patterns lead to? Teacher centers are one example; hands-on activities and workshops are another. Traditional university courses and advanced degrees are deemed less appropriate since university faculty are perceived as less relevant and too theoretical. The trend in an increasing number of states is to permit teacher groups and school systems to develop inservice academies to offer inhouse courses for keeping teacher licenses current. Teacher-controlled workshops designed on a concrete level which deal with the classroom problems perceived by teachers is the essence if this approach. Teachers decide what they need and who the instructors in their workshops will be. The inevitable content is of a very specific, technical nature. Salary increases and professional advancement rather than graduate degrees are the outcome. Training is clearly improved.

## The Common Good and Teacher Education

The value systems discussed previously--those supporting individualism and those supporting the pragmatic world of work--are as old as our society. They can be clearly connected to the curricula of liberal arts and professional education. The third American value pattern--commitment to the concepts of a democratic society--can be directly connected to a curriculum of general studies in an equally clear fashion. Unfortunately, general studies has all but disappeared from the lower schools and from the common core of requirements in the university. General studies are not merely a conglomeration of introductory courses in various disciplines. They are

intentionally planned content aimed at producing problem solving, thoughtful citizens. These studies include physical sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities taught in a manner which leads the students to a fuller understanding of the persistent problems of living in a democratic society. General studies can only be taught in a multi-disciplinary, integrated manner and learned through applications and analysis of knowledge to real-life problems. The integration of knowledge and the applications of such knowledge to life are not the sole responsibility of students but the effects of a curriculum planned and offered by a faculty committed to general education. At present, there is no widespread, serious development of such a general studies curriculum on any level of schooling.

In a real sense, education for the common good began with the Mayflower Compact in 1648 when the Puritans established the first common school. Their view of what content was needed to prepare children for meeting life's problems included reading the Bible, learning their code of morality and little else. But the avowed purpose of the first schools was to acculturate the young into adult society and for more than 300 years this remained the primary purpose of American public education. While content changed--direct Bible study was replaced by character education whereby literature and history were used to shape moral precepts--the avowed purpose of elementary, high school and the first years of college were to offer a curriculum that "made" Americans. This curriculum was in full force between 1890 and 1920 when 30 million immigrants were "melted" into American society by absorbing this general studies curriculum--a curriculum of history, English, basic sciences and the arts. This was neither a curriculum aimed at jobs nor the study of

liberal arts disciplines for their intrinsic worth. This general studies curriculum was conceived and taught as the very stuff for making a participatory citizenry, involved and active in their communities. Jobs were viewed as things individuals were to take care of on their own, or to get training for from a technical school, while the liberal arts were viewed as the domain of scholars devoted to esoteric studies which, by definition, were considered to be irrelevant and therefore, free of social constraints.

The current situation reflects a complete subordination of all curriculum purposes to that of job/career preparation. Liberal arts have been able to withstand this pragmatic pressure because they too represent strong cultural bases, i.e., the commitments to individual development, the maintenance of a high "culture" and academic freedom. There is also the fact that the graduate training of faculty is in specific liberal arts and not in the interdisciplinary studies required for teaching general studies. While the culture of jobs dominates the culture of individual development, therefore, the liberal arts remain alive and will persist by virtue of their own strong cultural wellsprings. The complete loser has been general studies programs dependent as they are on teachers who are generalists. When all the reward systems for university study and research are for specialists it is not surprising that the faculty who are interested and capable of offering general studies are never prepared in any university graduate schools. For example, the number of physicists who want to teach anything at all is significantly smaller than those who are engaged in some form of theory building or research. If we consider these few teachers and then raise the issue of interdisciplinary studies whereby these physicists would coteach with social

scientists and humanists, the number of physicists still interested in teaching shrinks even further. Yet, the number of students who can benefit from a general knowledge of physics is significantly larger than those seeking to "major" in physics. A similar situation exists in the lower schools where teachers are prepared and licensed to teach particular specialities, i.e., miniature liberal arts subjects (English) or occupational trades (computing). Even at the elementary level, the former generalists prepared as teachers are now criticized as lacking "in-depth substance." The almost universally accepted solution to the problems of low achievement in elementary and high school is that teachers need to "major" (in-depth) in one subject area, thereby becoming even less able to function as generalists with young children. The reasons for the popularity of these widespread disfunctionalities is not simply that people are evil or stupid--as endearing as those explanations sometimes seem. At least part of the explanation should be sought in the trends and shifts among basic American value patterns which undergird (and control) what curricula all schools offer. The dominance of utilitarian values over the development of individuals, and the dominance of both of those patterns over the notion of the common good, indeed the lack of interest in developing any commonalities among Americans, is part of the explanation for the demise of general studies curricula.

There have been notable experiments in teacher education which did make general studies the heart of the professional education offered teachers. New College at Teachers College, Columbia during the 1930's was an integrated effort to prepare citizen teachers who would understand the world and the nation, as well the states and localities that employed them. These future

teachers experienced a curriculum which advocated problem solving and the activity concept as the essential pedagogy for educating youngsters.

During this period the University of Chicago and other institutions experimented with general studies that would occupy the entire four years of undergraduate college. Eventually, these efforts, whether offered as teacher preparation or in arts and science colleges, dried up. The usual reasons offered were philosophical. In truth, there were also mundane and bureaucratic reasons which may be better explanations. It is more difficult to define faculty work loads if several faculty teach one course. It takes an inordinate amount of time to plan interdisciplinary course syllabi and faculty believe they have better things to do than go to endless meetings planning courses. It requires more time and effort to cooperatively decide on requirements and grading policies than to offer one's own course. There is a greater tension in teaching with and in front of colleagues than in teaching one's own course. The amount of effort to do all of this intrudes on faculty members' other priorities. These are just some of the pedestrian reasons why interdisciplinary general studies never "made it" in higher education. Added to these, of course, are the pressure which derive from the university culture to specialize ever more narrowly. All the status and prestige gradients, as well as all the tangible rewards which the university is capable of bestowing, are given for ever more narrow specializations. English professors study one author, chemists one type of catalytic action, historians become experts in the Bulgarian Revolution of 1876. The very essence of the university value system is to intensify specialization.

There is an analogous situation for the lower schools. It must also be noted that as the university emphasizes more specialization, the teachers it

produces will value such study. Even more, the curriculum of the lower schools will attempt to match the university curriculum (it never works in the other direction) in order to enable high school graduates to succeed in their advanced studies.

In sum, education is now perceived by the mass of Americans and offered by the public institutions on all levels, as a personal good. From day-care through graduate study, those who are to directly benefit from schooling are expected to pay for it, or as much of it as possible. Schooling is now sold as other services or products: in much the same way as gas, water or telephone services are sold to users, only the immediate consumer is perceived as deriving the benefits of educational services. There is some logic in this approach since, if school curricula have been transformed into job/career training programs, why shouldn't those who are going to earn higher incomes pay for such training? The widespread "need" for local taxpayers relief is a general reflection of the common perception that those without children have no responsibility for other people's children. The cutback in federal loans and grants to students is another indicator that education is a personal good, essentially career-training. Current public opinion may best be described as a rising tide of public expectations for what all schools should accomplish in preparing people for the world of work.

In summarizing the demise of general studies curriculum as an approach to teacher education, the answers to the same questions posed in earlier sections are as follows:

<u>What are dominant value themes in the American culture which support general education?</u> The commitment to democratic values undergirds the notion of the

common good. Democratic institutions including representational government, the legal system and all forms of community action are predicated on the assumption that all constituencies of our society perceive themselves as participants in a common heritage. Law and order is predicated on most people being law-abiding; similarly with the tax system. Public response to crises as well as unreflected upon assumptions about appropriate behavior all assume that we are one society--that in the main we can, to a workable degree, predict the actions of others and the responses of others to our actions. Without such a clear set of common agreements about mutual expectations we would not be able to function on an interactive basis in our daily lives.

How might these value themes be stated as a goal? The preparation of an informed, well-intentioned, active citizenry which will not only watchdog antisocial activity but which will initiate activity to solve common problems. A healthy community, state and nation is the goal.

What type of education is most likely to produce such individuals? School programs and teacher education programs should be based on problem solving. Content is learned primarily as it feeds into solutions to real world problems and not for its own sake. Cooperative learning is emphasized in addition to individual achievement. The integration of subjects and their application to persistent problems of living is the essence of the curriculum.

What kind of students are likely to self select such education? Those who have a social consciousness and who value their own involvement in communal activities would be most compatible with this approach. Also, those who see education as an instrumentality for improving the quality of life in the community. Those who might volunteer for the Peace Corps but who are put off

by current school bureaucracies and a curriculum they see divorced from life problems would be an example of such a population. Those who participated in university extension activities which have transformed rural America would be another example of a population concerned with applying knowledge to communal improvement.

What kind of teacher education might be offered by such an approach? Teacher education would emphasize the same general education studies advocated for tne elementary and high schools only at a higher level. Teachers would be organized into inservice workshops that focused on the problems of living which most affect education in their communities. Examples of topics studied and the activities engaged in might be issues such as setting school policies for students with AIDS or those who are pregnant. Issues such as job development in urban areas, the community's financial support for schools, how to provide high quality day-care and the impact of segregated housing, are other examples of subjects the citizen-teacher (and ultimately the children) might become involved in.

How are such teachers evaluated? Their participation in community activities is paramount. Most of all, the teachers would deal with problems now regarded as interference into the school curriculum and would make such issues legitimate study for children and youth.

What kind of lower school curriculum does this cultural pattern foster? The school curriculum would include life problems faced by the students which would be organized into themes around which current content could be learned in more integrated, meaningful ways. Searching student lockers, or placing police in the high school, would not be regarded as an intrusion but would

become subjects of study--both for staff and students. Issues of the food served, or all manner of school rules, would provide similar opportunities. English teachers who complain that students are nonverbal, or History teachers who complain about lack of interest in studying the Bill of Rights, might discover that students can be vitally interested in participatory learning of actual problems.

What kind of staff development would these value patterns lead to? Again, space does not permit more than a few examples. Teachers' inservice would range from topics such as "Who is the school's instructional leader?" and "How should teachers be evaluated?" to "What is the teacher's role in having students utilize the school's sex clinic?" There would, of course, be inservice programs for teachers on "How international trade affects the U.S. dollar.", "Refinancing the rebuilding of the local community's infrastructure." and "The meaning of recent Supreme Court decisions on school curricula." In short, the education of the teacher, not merely as a citizen in the abstract, but as an involved citizen of the community and school, would be emphasized. There would be a clear connection and continuity between the topics studied by teachers and students. There would also be a very close connection between how such studies are pursued and the nature of the problems studied.

## Implications for Teacher Development in Future

We can be certain that the advocates for professional education will remain dominant. The cultural support for schooling that leads to jobs and careers will continue to support a comparable form of teacher development that

emphasizes more effective methods for teachers. It will continue to make sense to all constituencies--including teachers--that what teachers need most is more relevance to their immediate tasks, more hands-on direct experience, and more attention to the ever present problems of how to improve class discipline, how to teach basic skills more effectively, how to motivate, and how to cover more material faster. Such teacher development is less likely to take the form of graduate degrees--or university courses at all--and is more likely to take the form of inservice programs controlled by the employing school system. In some cases local teachers' unions will offer the training. In effect, teachers have self identified development needs which are most like those identified by the parents of at-risk students and by at-risk students themselves: training rather than education; concrete information rather than abstract principles; basic skills rather than problem solving methodologies; practical competencies which require following directions and completing assigned tasks rather than critical thinking in general.

A second trend, much less pervasive but persistently advocated, will continue to propose more liberal arts coursework. This advocacy will have increasing impact on preservice teacher education programs and almost no influence whatever on inservice teacher development. The reasons are clear: undergraduates can be required to take more liberal arts but most school systems and teachers see little relevance in more liberal arts courses helping them solve the problems they face. Even more important, the overwhelming number of teachers do not have the prerequisites to be admitted to graduate school coursework in the liberal arts and undergraduate courses meet more than once per week. Undergraduate liberal arts courses are also not "packaged"

(i.e., scheduled, priced or located) to facilitate practicing teachers taking them. This experience of liberal arts not reaching into inservice was well documented by over 20 million dollars spent on NDEA institutes that ended up as summer offerings influencing few schools and even fewer teachers.

The advocacy for more general education, as a reflection of the shared values Americans hold relative to democratic living will continue to be ignored. University systems will continue to reinforce overspecialization and the existing dichotomy between the liberal arts college versus the professional schools. Teachers will be the victims of this crossfire and will not be prepared to offer general education. Lower schools will continue to emphasize basic skills and preparation for jobs/careers in response to the public perception that education is a personal good (i.e., job training).

The implications of these predictions for teaching is that it will become increasingly solidified as an occupation with less concern for professional development and greater emphasis on staff training. Such training will focus on the craft elements of teaching and on making teachers more effective technical personnel. These predictions are, of course, not advocacies. They are derived from the basic assumption undergirding my analysis; that dominant American value systems control the nature of schooling which in turn controls the nature of teacher education.

1/2846V